PROPOSED MOTION: ADOPTION OF EAST HADDAM VILLAGE DISTRICT ZONING REGULATIONS AS A GATEWAY STANDARD

BE IT MOVED THAT the East Haddam Village District Zoning Regulations, adopted by the East Haddam Planning and Zoning Commission as Section 9.5, effective February 1, 2005, are hereby adopted as a standard of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission, as provided in the Connecticut General Statutes Section 25-102g. The only area affected by this adoption is the area described in Section 9.5.1 of the East Haddam Zoning Regulations in the February 1, 2005 revisions.

The Gateway Commission finds the following:

The East Haddam Village District regulations were adopted by the East Haddam Planning and Zoning Commission after extensive study and consideration of the natural and traditional riverway scene in the vicinity of East Haddam Village;

The East Haddam Village area is unique within the Gateway Conservation Zone, having an historic density, architecture and function which differs from the remainder of the Zone, and thus is best protected by a standard which differs from those applied elsewhere within the Zone and which has been designed specifically for the village area;

The regulations are intended to protect the distinctive character, landscape and historic structures within the District;

The study and resultant regulations, conducted with town funding, achieve a level of specificity and detail beyond that which has been applied elsewhere within the Gateway Conservation Zone, due to the limitations on financial resources available to the Gateway Commission;

The regulations provide East Haddam with the tools to assure that new development or redevelopment within the East Haddam Village portion of the Conservation Zone will recognize and reflect the unique historic village character, as well as the natural and traditional riverway scene;

The Gateway Commission is a partner with the eight member towns in protecting the character of the lower Connecticut River, and recognizes that its member towns may sometimes take the lead in pursuing the mutual mission of the Gateway Commission;

THEREFORE, the Gateway Commission finds it is in the best interests of the Gateway area and consistent with the purposes and provisions of Chapter 447a of the Connecticut General Statutes to adopt this motion.
CONNECTICUT RIVER GATEWAY COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

January 26, 2006

Present/Absent:  
CHESTER  Margaret Wilson, Christine Nelson  
DEEP RIVER Irwin Wilcox, Nancy Fischbach  
EAST HADDAM Robert Boulware, Logan Clarke  
ESSEX Fred Vollono, Ed Marlowe  
FENWICK Chuck Chadwick  
HADDAM Scott Thompson, Susan Bement  
LYME Kevin Mazer, J. Melvin Woody  
OLD LYME Rudi Besier, Ted Crosby  
OLD SAYBROOK Madge Fish, David LeMay  
CRERPA Alan Bayreuther, Doris Sanstrom  
MIDSTATE RPA Raul De Brigard, Stasia DeMichèle  
DEP David Blatt  
STAFF Linda Krause, Dorothy Papp, Judy Preston

Call to Order
Chairman Fred Vollono called the regular meeting of the Gateway Commission to order at 7:30 pm in the CRERPA meeting room. Upon request Logan Clarke moved to change the order of the agenda to accommodate Judy Preston's conflicting Inland Wetlands Meeting in Old Saybrook. Ed Marlowe seconded. All were in favor.

Approval of Minutes
Rupe Wilcox moved to approve the minutes of December 1, 2005. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Correspondence/Staff Report

Linda Krause reported on the following correspondence:

- Gateway received a copy of a letter of resignation from Irwin (Rupe) Wilcox after 30 years of participation on the Gateway Commission. Chairman Vollono noted that the letter was "accepted with a great deal of regret."

- There was an editorial in the Hartford Courant in support of the Gateway Commission's appeal of Chester's ZBA decision.
• Cynthia Matthew, organizer of the group to protect the Haagenson Preserve, e-mailed an update from the Attorney General's office stating that there is a clear legal case to be made if CT Audobon does not respect the contributing property owner's intent for preservation.

• About a dozen Haddam residents expressed concern for the proposed placement of a telecommunication tower in the GW zone with a letter to Haddam’s First Selectman. Raul discussed the situation with the First Selectman who said there will be a town meeting prior to any action and promised to keep the Gateway Commission informed. Linda will respond to the residents thanking them for keeping the Gateway informed and explaining the Gateway’s mission to protect the natural scene from the river itself.

• Robert Smith wrote again to express interest in buying Gateway property for the purpose of restoration to historic levels. Linda will respond that no policies for such action are yet in place.

• The Gateway received a copy of the Final Draft of the Old Saybrook amendment to the Plan of Conservation of Open Space.

• A group called "Teaming with Wild Life" is requesting a letter of endorsement from the Gateway for protection of wild life throughout the State. **Raul de Brigard moved to make an endorsement.** Nancy Fischbach seconded. The vote met with silence and it was decided that David Blatt will research the group further through DEP.  

Treasurer’s Report

Peggy Wilson noted progress in Gateway’s investments over the past calendar year and reported 5 bills to be paid:
$369.60 to Andrews, Young & Geraghty for work on the Chester ZBA Appeal
$609.08 to CRERPA for November staff services
$541.66 to CRERPA for December staff services
$1478.40 to CRERPA for November Tidewater Services
$2032.80 to CRERPA for December Tidewater Services. This is the last payment authorized to Tidewater at this time.

**Logan Clarke moved to pay the bills.** Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.
Referrals

Linda reported that there were several referrals without significant impact since December’s meeting.

In addition, there is an application from a private individual to change the subdivision regulations in East Haddam to extend the maximum length of a cul de sac. The public hearing is scheduled for February 28 so the Gateway Commission has time until their next meeting to further research the impacts of such a change and still respond in a timely fashion. Commission members were wary of the possible impacts of such a change and asked Linda to commence research.

The Old Saybrook Zoning Commission is proposing to improve their Residence AAA District to further mandate cluster housing. It would appear that there will be no significant impacts to the Gateway Zone but there will still be time to comment after the proposal is made.

Other/New Business

The Chester ZBA Appeal is being supported by the State’s Attorney General’s office who has drafted the necessary paperwork to intervene on behalf of DEP.

The DEP Commissioner has officially announced that the Office of Long Island Sound Programs will be amalgamated into the Water Bureau at DEP. David Blatt said that OLISP Director Charlie Evans has announced his retirement somewhat earlier than expected resulting in the somewhat surprise timing of the move. Linda noted that her first job as a planner was as an intern at OLISP and that this move marked the end of an era.

Ed Marlowe asked about the status of the gabion wall in Old Saybrook. David Blatt reported that the applicant’s lawyer originally called DEP but has since dropped the ball. There is reason to believe that an enforcement order to remove the wall may be in the DEP pipeline.

Nancy Fischbach brought up the importance of getting back to tree cutting/landscaping regulations in the Gateway. Switchback driveways are a particular concern.

Guests

DEP Fellow, Terry Yasoko Ogawa attended the meeting and reported that she had found much of the evening’s discussion helpful in her work to study and develop visual impact methodology in the Gateway Zone.
Dave Kozak, from the DEP, gave a PowerPoint presentation on Coastal Land Assessment Methodology (CLAM) and the results of an attempt to inventory and prioritize significant properties still available for possible conservation in Connecticut’s coastal area. Limited land availability, scarce funding, and lack of inventory all contribute to making this work of significant importance to the Gateway in particular.

Tidewater Institute

Judy Preston reported that she has recently applied to the EPA for a "ground truthing" grant in the Gateway region. Her full report is attached to these minutes along with her request for further funding from the Gateway in the amount of 8 hours a week at $35/hour through June, 2006. Peggy Wilson asked that Judy provide a monthly timesheet detailing her time spent on Gateway matters. Logan Clarke moved to continue paying Judy for 8 hours/week not to exceed $7000 through June, 2006. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Logan Clarke moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dorothy Papp.

The next meeting of the Gateway Commission is Thursday, February 26, 2006
### Request for funding from the Gateway Commission
#### January 2006 through June 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Monthly Amt</th>
<th>Total Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2005 to December 2005</td>
<td>Tidewater Institute consulting fee 8 hours/week @$35.00/hr</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td>$4480 (four months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>8 hours/week @$35.00/hr consulting fee</td>
<td>$1120/month</td>
<td>$6720 (six months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Tidewater Institute Can Bring to Gateway

- An active outreach person to work with Gateway towns
- Fundraising ability (collaboration with CRERPA, others)
- Education to Gateway Communities regarding the biological/ecological significance of the Gateway Conservation Zone (walks program, lectures, Middlesex Community College courses)
- Broad range of contacts for partnerships and collaboration, including LIS/EPA, CACIWC, NonPoint Source Working Group (LSI), Yale, Wesleyan, DEP

### Immediate projects

- Lower Connecticut River Riparian Buffers Mapping, identification of protection and restoration opportunities, buffers brochure
- Ground Truthing Project (grant outstanding)
- Land Use Leadership Alliance (LULA) working to establish this program in CT
- Educational walks and talks program in the Gateway towns (CT River Museum/Old Lyme Library)
- Engaging Wesleyan students in Service Learning Community Based Conservation class (fall 2006) in Gateway towns, requiring outreach component
REGULAR MEETING

NOTICE & AGENDA

DATE: January 26, 2006
TIME: 7:30 PM
PLACE: C.R.E.R.P.A. Conference Room
Saybrook Junction Marketplace
Unit 2 - First Floor
Old Saybrook, CT 06475

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance and Approval of 12/01/05 Minutes
3. Tidewater Institute
4. Staff Report
   a. Guests
   b. Correspondence
5. Finances
   a. Treasurer's Report
   b. Approval of Bills
6. Referrals - As Received
7. Status of New Standards
8. Other Business
   Chester Appeal Status
   Haagenson Preserve Status
9. Adjournment

Next meeting of Gateway Commission is Thursday, February 23, 2006
Connecticut River Gateway Commission
PO Box 778
Old Saybrook CT 06475-0778

A. IN ACCORANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 1-21 OF THE GENERAL STATUTES, THE FOLLOWING IS A SCHEDULE OF THE REGULAR MEETINGS FOR 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATES</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 26, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 24, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION: CRERPA Conference Room
7:30 p.m.
455 Boston Post Road
Unit 2, First Floor
Old Saybrook, CT 06475

Linda B. Krause, Executive Director
Tel: 860/388/3497 – FAX: 860/395/1404

Cc: Town Clerks of the Estuary Region    DEP
Received & filed with the Secretary of State
CONNECTICUT RIVER GATEWAY COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

December 1, 2005

Present/Absent:  
CHESTER  Margaret Wilson, Christine Nelson
DEEP RIVER Irwin Wilcox, Nancy Fischbach
EAST HADDAM Robert Boulware, Logan Clarke
ESSEX Fred Vollono, Ed Mariowe
FENWICK Chuck Chadwick
HADDAM Scott Thompson, Susan Bement
LYME Kevin Mazer, J. Melvin Woody
OLD LYME Rudi Besier, Ted Crosby
OLD SAYBROOK Madge Fish, David LeMay
CRERPA Alan Bayreuther, Doris Sanstrom
MIDSTATE RPA Raul De Brigard, Stasia DeMichele
DEP David Blatt
STAFF Linda Krause, Dorothy Papp, Judy Preston

Call to Order

Chairman Fred Vollono called the regular meeting of the Gateway Commission to order at 7:30 pm in the CRERPA meeting room.

Approval of Minutes

Logan Clarke moved to approve the minutes of October 27, 2005. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Correspondence/Staff Report

Linda Krause reported that of the nine CRERPA towns, four elected new selectmen in November. They are Clinton, Chester, Killingworth, and Westbrook. A regional orientation to include the Gateway Commission/Region is scheduled for December 14, 2005. In other election news, of the eight Midstate towns, there are also four new selectmen, though the selectmen for Haddam and East Haddam were both reelected. Stasia DeMichele was reelected to the Haddam Planning Commission.

The Commission received a notice of a public information workshop in Old Saybrook on Tuesday, December 20, regarding the concept plan for Founder’s Park at the base of the old leaf dump.

The Land Trust Alliance sent an obituary for their founder Kingsbury Browne.
Treasurer's Report

Peggy Wilson reported 4 bills to be paid:
$155 to Andrews, Young & Geraghty for work on the Chester ZBA Appeal
$703.89 to CRERPA for October staff services
$2217.60 to CRERPA for Tidewater Services
$1730 to Chubb Insurance for liability insurance

Logan Clarke moved to pay the bills. Rudi Besier seconded. All were in favor.

Referrals

There were no referrals to report for October.

Guests

John Schroeder, architect for Dave and Maria Offinoski in Chester, presented some early design concepts for a house on a previously undeveloped lot north of Parker's Point and south of Middletown Yacht Club. The proposed coverage will entail a special permit according to the current Gateway Standards and Mr. Schroeder wanted to get a sense of design priorities from the Commission. Roofline, color, riparian buffer, tree cover maintenance were all touched on. Mr. Schroeder assured the Commission that his clients were outdoor enthusiasts committed to helping to maintain the “traditional and natural river scene.”

Tidewater Institute

Linda Krause noted that the Gateway’s commitment to Tidewater was through December only and that no further request had been made to date.

Status of Gateway Standards

Linda reported that East Haddam is quite close to having their public hearing and passing the new standards.

Rudi noted that the process has stalled out for the time being in Old Lyme due to the interpretation of the riparian buffer requirement as too restrictive on the individual property owners.
Other/New Business

Linda Krause distributed proposed wording for a motion to adopt the East Haddam Village District zoning regulations as a Gateway Standard. Rudi Besier proposed the addition of the word *only* to the *area affected* in the first paragraph. Nancy Fischbach noted that the same paragraph should refer to the East Haddam Zoning Regulations.

**Nancy Fischbach moved to accept the motion as revised.** Logan Clarke seconded. All were in favor. The full motion is attached to these minutes.

The necessary papers for the appeal of the Chester board of Appeals decision have been filed. There has been no further action to date.

Linda received a memo regarding a meeting about the Haagenson Preserved that has been rescheduled to December 15 at Anita Balleck's home, to discuss possible acquisition of the property for conservation. The town, the land trust, and the Gateway have each expressed interest in helping such an acquisition.

**Logan Clarke moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 pm.**

The next meeting of the Gateway Commission is Thursday, January 26, 2006
CONNECTICUT RIVER GATEWAY COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

October 27, 2005

Present/Absent: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Representative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>Margaret Wilson, Christine Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEP RIVER</td>
<td>Irwin Wilcox, Nancy Fischbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST HADDAM</td>
<td>Robert Boullware, Logan Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX</td>
<td>Fred Vollono, Ed Marlowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FENWICK</td>
<td>Chuck Chadwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HADDAM</td>
<td>Scott Thompson, Susan Bement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYME</td>
<td>Kevin Mazer, J. Melvin Woody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD LYME</td>
<td>Rudi Besler, Ted Crosby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD SAYBROOK</td>
<td>Madge Fish, David LeMay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRERPA</td>
<td>Alan Bayreuther, Doris Sanstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDSTATE RPA</td>
<td>Raul De Brigard, Stasia DeMichele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>David Blatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>Linda Krause, Dorothy Papp, Judy Preston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to Order
Chairman Fred Vollono called the regular meeting of the Gateway Commission to order at 7:30 pm in the CRERPA meeting room.

Approval of Minutes
Logan Clarke moved to approve the minutes of October 27, 2005. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Correspondence/Staff Report

Linda Krause reported that of the nine CRERPA towns, four elected new selectmen in November. They are Clinton, Chester, Killingworth, and Westbrook. A regional orientation to include the Gateway Commission/Region is scheduled for December 14, 2005. In other election news, of the eight Midstate towns, there are also four new selectmen, though the selectmen for Haddam and East Haddam were both reelected. Stasia DeMichele was reelected to the Haddam Planning Commission.

The Commission received a notice of a public information workshop in Old Saybrook on Tuesday, December 20, regarding the concept plan for Founder’s Park at the base of the old leaf dump.

The Land Trust Alliance sent an obituary for their founder Kingsbury Browne.
Treasurer’s Report

Peggy Wilson reported 4 bills to be paid:
$155 to Andrews, Young & Geraghty for work on the Chester ZBA Appeal
$703.89 to CRERPA for October staff services
$2217.60 to CRERPA for Tidewater Services
$1730 to Chubb Insurance for liability insurance

Logan Clarke moved to pay the bills. Rudi Besier seconded. All were in favor.

Referrals

There were no referrals to report for October.

Guests

John Schroeder, architect for Dave and Maria Otfinoski in Chester, presented some early design concepts for a house on a previously undeveloped lot north of Parker’s Point and south of Middletown Yacht Club. The proposed coverage will entail a special permit according to the current Gateway Standards and Mr. Schroeder wanted to get a sense of design priorities from the Commission. Roofline, color, riparian buffer, tree cover maintenance were all touched on. Mr. Schroeder assured the Commission that his clients were outdoor enthusiasts committed to helping to maintain the “traditional and natural river scene.”

Tidewater Institute

Linda Krause noted that the Gateway’s commitment to Tidewater was through December only and that no further request had been made to date.

Status of Gateway Standards

Linda reported that East Haddam is quite close to having their public hearing and passing the new standards.

Rudi noted that the process has stalled out for the time being in Old Lyme due to the interpretation of the riparian buffer requirement as too restrictive on the individual property owners.
Other/New Business

Linda Krause distributed proposed wording for a motion to adopt the East Haddam Village District zoning regulations as a Gateway Standard. Rudi Besier proposed the addition of the word only to the area affected in the first paragraph. Nancy Fischbach noted that the same paragraph should refer to the East Haddam Zoning Regulations.

**Nancy Fischbach moved to accept the motion as revised.** Logan Clarke seconded. All were in favor. The full motion is attached to these minutes.

The necessary papers for the appeal of the Chester board of Appeals decision have been filed. There has been no further action to date.

Linda received a memo regarding a meeting about the Haagenson Preserved that has been rescheduled to December 15 at Anita Balleck’s home, to discuss possible acquisition of the property for conservation. The town, the land trust, and the Gateway have each expressed interest in helping such an acquisition.

**Logan Clarke moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:17 pm.**

**The next meeting of the Gateway Commission is Thursday, January 26, 2006.**
PROPOSED MOTION: ADOPTION OF EAST HADDAM VILLAGE DISTRICT ZONING
REGULATIONS AS A GATEWAY STANDARD

BE IT MOVED THAT the East Haddam Village District Zoning Regulations, adopted by the East
Haddam Planning and Zoning Commission as Section 9.5, effective February 1, 2005, are hereby
adopted as a standard of the Connecticut River Gateway Commission, as provided in the
Connecticut General Statutes Section 25-102g. The only area affected by this adoption is the
area described in Section 9.5.1 of the East Haddam Zoning Regulations in the February 1, 2005
revisions.

The Gateway Commission finds the following:

The East Haddam Village District regulations were adopted by the East Haddam Planning and
Zoning Commission after extensive study and consideration of the natural and traditional riverway
scene in the vicinity of East Haddam Village;

The East Haddam Village area is unique within the Gateway Conservation Zone, having an
historic density, architecture and function which differs from the remainder of the Zone, and thus
is best protected by a standard which differs from those applied elsewhere within the Zone and
which has been designed specifically for the village area;

The regulations are intended to protect the distinctive character, landscape and historic structures
within the District;

The study and resultant regulations, conducted with town funding, achieve a level of specificity
and detail beyond that which has been applied elsewhere within the Gateway Conservation Zone,
due to the limitations on financial resources available to the Gateway Commission;

The regulations provide East Haddam with the tools to assure that new development or
redevelopment within the East Haddam Village portion of the Conservation Zone will recognize
and reflect the unique historic village character, as well as the natural and traditional riverway
scene;

The Gateway Commission is a partner with the eight member towns in protecting the character of
the lower Connecticut River, and recognizes that its member towns may sometimes take the lead
in pursuing the mutual mission of the Gateway Commission;

THEREFORE, the Gateway Commission finds it is in the best interests of the Gateway area and
consistent with the purposes and provisions of Chapter 447a of the Connecticut General Statutes
to adopt this motion.
REGULAR MEETING

NOTICE & AGENDA

DATE: December 1, 2005
TIME: 7:30 PM
PLACE: C.R.E.R.P.A. Conference Room or designated place due to remodeling
        Saybrook Junction Marketplace
        Unit 2 - First Floor
        Old Saybrook, CT 06475

1. Call to Order
2. Acceptance and Approval of 10/27/05 Minutes
3. Staff Report
   a. Guests
   b. Correspondence
4. Finances
   a. Treasurer's Report
   b. Approval of Bills
5. Referrals - As Received
6. Tidewater Institute
7. Status of New Standards
8. Other Business
   Action on Public Hearing
   Chester Appeal Status
   Haagenson Preserve Status
9. Adjournment

Next meeting of Gateway Commission is Thursday, January 26, 2006

May your holidays be bright, joyful and delicious!
ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES

October 27, 2005

Present/Absent:  CHESTER  Margaret Wilson, Christine Nelson
DEEP RIVER  Irwin Wilcox, Nancy Fischbach
EAST HADDAM  Robert Boulware, Logan Clarke
ESSEX  Fred Vollono, Ed Marlowe
FENWICK  Chuck Chadwick
HADDAM  Scott Thompson, Susan Bement
LYME  Kevin Mazer, J. Melvin Woody
OLD LIME  Rudi Besier, Ted Crosby
OLD SAYBROOK  Madge Fish, David LeMay
CRERPA  Alan Bayreuther, Doris Sanstrom
MIDSTATE RPA  Raul De Brigard, Stasia DeMichele
DEP  David Blatt
STAFF  Linda Krause, Dorothy Papp, Judy Preston

Call to Order
The annual meeting was called to order by Chairman Fred Vollono at 7:04 pm in the CRERPA meeting room.

Logan Clarke moved to show a vote of confidence in the Commission's current leadership. Peggy Wilson seconded. All were in favor.
Logan Clarke moved to adjourn the annual meeting at 7:06 pm.
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

October 27, 2005

Present/Absent:

- CHESTER: Margaret Wilson, Christine Nelson
- DEEP RIVER: Irwin Wilcox, Nancy Fischbach
- EAST HADDAM: Robert Boulware, Logan Clarke
- ESSEX: Fred Vollono, Ed Marlowe
- FENWICK: Chuck Chadwick
- HADDAM: Scott Thompson, Susan Bement
- LYME: Kevin Mazer, J. Melvin Woody
- OLD LYME: Rudi Besier, Ted Crosby
- OLD SAYBROOK: Madge Fish, David LeMay
- CRERPA: Alan Bayreuther, Doris Sanstrom
- MIDSTATE RPA: Reul De Brigard, Stasia DeMichiele
- DEP: David Blatt
- STAFF: Linda Krause, Dorothy Papp, Judy Preston

Call to Order
Chairman Fred Vollono called the regular meeting of the Gateway Commission to order at 7:08 pm in the CRERPA meeting room.

Approval of Minutes
Nancy Fischbach moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2005. Logan Clarke seconded. Rudi Besier asked that the minutes be corrected to show his presence at the meeting. All voted to approve the minutes as corrected.

Correspondence/Staff Report
Linda Krause reported on the following correspondence:

- A written request from Robert P. Smith of Moodus expressing an interest to buy a portion of the Gateway property located at the corners of Porges and Creek Roads. Concern was expressed regarding the land’s and request’s proximity to the Haagenson Preserve property. On the other hand, it might well be that funds from the sale of a small portion of property not visible from the river could be put toward the purchase of higher priority land. Linda will reply to Mr. Smith stating the Commission’s several questions warranting research.
• A response from the Attorney General’s office concerning the proposed Haagensen Preserve sale, a copy of which is filed with these minutes.
• An e-mail from Cynthia Matthew, Chair of the Friends of the Haagenson Preserve explaining their current status of negotiations with CT Audobon for purchase of the property.
• A copy of the letter from DEP to the Attorney General wishing to intervene on the Chester ZBA Appeal, filed with these minutes. Linda also noted that CRERPA took several photographs showing the appeal property under water in recent flood conditions.
• News articles of interest included the Rivers at Risk series in the Hartford Courant; a New York Times article elucidating the challenges of keeping trees in favor of bushes along waterfront property; a Hartford Courant article entitled Cozy vs. Colossal; and an article reporting that the Goodspeed Theater is suspending its fundraising for a new theater until further notice.

At 7:40 pm Logan Clarke moved to recess the regular meeting to open the public hearing as advertised. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Public Hearing on Proposed Gateway Standard

Chairman Fred Vollono opened the public hearing at 7:40 pm in the CRERPA meeting room.
• Ted Crosby read the Legal Notice as printed in the Middletown Press into the record.
• Chairman Vollono read correspondence into the record consisting of a letter from Stanley Greimann opposed to the proposed new standard. Linda Krause noted that she had received verbal comment from East Haddam Town Planner, Jim Ventres, speaking in favor of the proposal. Logan Clarke stated for the record that East Haddam’s Village District was the result of extensive research and a well thought out process.
• Chairman Vollono asked for public comment. There was none.
• Chairman Vollono asked for staff comment. Linda Krause spoke in favor of the proposal.

There being no further comment for the record, Nancy Fishbach moved to close the public hearing at 7:58 pm. Rupe Wilcox seconded. All were in favor. The regular meeting of the Gateway Commission was resumed at 7:58 pm.

Proposed Gateway Standard Discussion

Melvin Woody expressed interest in a legal opinion as proposed by Stanley Greimann. Fred Vollono explained that a legal opinion can not protect the Commission. Precedent can always be cited. The question is more whether it would hold sway with the court. Nancy Fishbach said the important question is
whether the proposed standard is in conflict with the statute. Linda noted that a legal opinion would in all likelihood use her as a primary source of information based on her experience with the statute and regulations, and she is confident that there is no conflict.

Rupe Wilcox said he thought the problem was in not knowing the future and the kinds of development pressures a standard of this type might inadvertently encourage. Ted Crosby noted the very act of exercising the Commission’s power to enact regulations opens the possibility for them to be tested; that it is the nature of the beast. Fred Vollono said the discussion pointed up the importance that the Commission be specific in its resolution so that there is no question that the standard applies only to the Village District in East Haddam.

Melvin Woody said that to his way of understanding the proposal at this point, the Commission would actually be setting a preferred precedent, in that Essex might take the idea and make their own proposal as a means of buying into the Gateway Standards as a whole. Nancy Fischbach agreed that a different change may be appropriate for Essex, and conceivably Deep River may want to develop a standard for Main Street to protect the natural and traditional river scene there.

Rudi Bessier asked why the Gateway Commission did not respond to East Haddam’s regulation changes in the first place. Linda Krause responded that when Jim Ventres came in to explain the changes, her perception was that the Commission liked what they saw and were supportive of the concept of incorporating East Haddam’s work into the Gateway Regulations. Linda further anticipated that Essex should do something similar in process and appropriate to its own situation. The proposal serves to refine the standards to accommodate a place where village density is the traditional scene. It is not applicable to the entire Gateway Zone, but it is appropriate here. David Blatt added that at the public hearing almost two years ago, Essex complained that the proposed standards did not apply to Essex Village. Allowing for special exceptions to one size fits all standards is a much more dangerous precedent than establishing specific standards to apply to specific districts. This proposal keeps the power with the Gateway Commission.

Nancy Fischbach noted that history itself is not frozen in time and to preserve an historical character, change is often called for.

Linda Krause reiterated that East Haddam had gone the extra distance to cooperate with the purpose and intent of the Gateway. Stasia DeMichele, a member of Haddam’s Planning and Zoning Commission, reported that when their commission read the letter accompanying the proposal for public hearing, the members felt encouraged by the Gateway Commission’s flexibility and support for a town’s efforts.

Nancy Fischbach moved to table the proposal for staff preparation of a draft motion to be presented at the Commission’s next meeting. Rupe Wilcox seconded. All were in favor.
Treasurer’s Report

Peggy Wilson reported 6 bills to be paid:
$71.30 to Andrews, Young & Geraghty for work on the Chester ZBA Appeal
$1400.67 to CRERPA for September staff services
$877.80 to CRERPA for Tidewater Services
$72.06 to The Middletown Press for the public hearing notice
$4000 to Lewitz, Balosie, Wollack etc. for the audit
$263 to Chubb Insurance for liability insurance

Logan Clarke moved to pay the bills. Nancy Fischbach seconded. All were in favor.

Referrals

There were no referrals to report for September.

Tidewater Institute

Judy Preston is attending a hearing on The Preserve in Old Saybrook. She is applying for a year’s extension to the Riparian Buffer Grant as flooding and other weather conditions have kept her from being able to get on the river.

Status of Gateway Standards

Ted Crosby said that he is approaching the difficulty of passing the riparian buffer Gateway standards in Old Lyme through a stormwater ordinance. Rudi Bessier reported that he spoke with some people on Old Lyme’s zoning commission but that they were still adamant that private property rights were a higher priority than a riparian buffer.

Linda reported that the Eight Mile River Advisory Committee has finished its report including recommendations to reduce impervious surfaces, pursue aggressive open space programs, regulate for alternative subdivisions, give more attention to stormwater quality, and create a standard for riparian buffers along first and second order streams. The riparian buffer standard was based on the latest Gateway Standards.

Other/New Business

Ed Marlowe asked David Blatt if he might be able to find an update from the DEP on the Gabion Wall in Old Saybrook. There being no further business, Rupe Wilcox moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:03 pm.

The next meeting of the Gateway Commission is Thursday, December 1, 2005
LEGAL NOTICE
CONNECTICUT RIVER GATEWAY COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED GATEWAY STANDARD
October 27, 2005

The Connecticut River Gateway Commission will hold a public hearing at 7:30 pm on October 27, 2005 in the CRERPA Meeting Room, Saybrook Junction Marketplace, Unit 2, 455 Boston Post Road, Old Saybrook, CT. on a proposed amendment to the Connecticut River Gateway Standards. The amendment would adopt Section 9.5 of the East Haddam Zoning Regulations as a standard for a portion of the Connecticut River conservation zone under Section 25-102g of the Connecticut General Statutes. Section 9.5, East Haddam Village District, which was adopted by the Town of East Haddam in February 2005, creates a mixed use district for the area historically known as Goodspeed Landing and Upper Landing. The East Haddam Village District regulations are intended to protect the distinctive character, landscape and historic structures within the district.

At this hearing, interested persons may be heard and written correspondence received.

Frederick Vollono, Chairman
Connecticut River Gateway Commission
To: Connecticut River Gateway member towns -
(Zoning Commissions, Planning Commissions, combined Planning and
Zoning Commissions, Conservation Commissions, and Commission staff)

From: Linda Krause, Gateway staff, for the Connecticut River Gateway
Commission

Date: September 6, 2005

The purpose of this memo is to update land use commissions and staff in
Gateway towns on several issues, as follows:

1. Notice of Proposed Amendment to Gateway Standards affecting East
   Haddam
2. Adoption of Revised Gateway Standards - Status Update
3. Requirement for ZBA to refer variances in the Conservation District to the
   municipal conservation commission (in addition to the Gateway
   Commission)
4. Gateway appeal of Chester variance

1. EAST HADDAM VILLAGE DISTRICT GATEWAY STANDARD
   AMENDMENT:
   The Connecticut River Gateway Commission will hold a public hearing at
   7:30 pm on Thursday, October 27, 2005 on a proposed amendment to the
   Gateway standards affecting land in East Haddam located in the town’s East
   Haddam Village District. The Village District is a new district in East Haddam,
   adopted in February of this year under the village district statutes, after a
detailed study of the area. As is noted in the description of the new district,
the Village District was settled as two separate villages, Goodspeed Landing
and Upper Landing. The two small villages eventually grew together and were
an historic center of commerce and civic activity. After a period of decline in
the area, the new district is intended to capture the energy generated by the
resurgence of the Opera House and the Gelston House. The regulations
include detailed “guidelines for site design and compatibility objectives” for the
district.
According to the CGS Section 25-102a, the purpose of the Gateway Commission's activities is to preserve the natural and traditional riverway scene. The recent revisions to the Gateway standards were designed to address the issue of large, obtrusive and primarily residential development throughout the Conservation District. The East Haddam village area has a different historic character. The extensive work by East Haddam has identified that character and includes regulations to reinforce the traditional land use pattern and design. The East Haddam Village District differs from the Gateway standards for the rest of the river valley in that it allows construction of a new "live theater" which is taller than the current Gateway height limit for other structures. Other buildings must meet the Gateway height limitations. The Gateway Commission proposes to adopt the East Haddam Village District regulations as a Gateway standard because it furthers the mission of the Gateway statutes, based on extensive work and deliberation by the town. Your comments are welcome.

2. ADOPTION OF FEBRUARY 2004 AMENDED STANDARDS:
The Gateway standards, originally adopted in 1974, were recently amended effective February 26, 2004. The eight member towns of the Gateway Compact were requested to "promptly" incorporate the new standards into local zoning regulations. To date, the standards have been adopted by Deep River, Chester, Haddam and Lyme. Old Saybrook and East Haddam have indicated their intent to include the standards in their regulations in the near future. The Borough of Fenwick, with its own independent zoning, is in the process of adding Gateway standards to their other zoning revisions. Only Essex and Old Lyme have expressed strong reservations about the standards. The Essex Zoning Commission is concerned about the burden of the special permit process for houses in excess of 4000 square feet. Some members of the Old Lyme Zoning Commission have expressed concern about the riparian buffer requirement for waterfront property. It is hoped that the experience of the other towns will ease the fears of the remaining towns. The Gateway Commission is unaware of any difficulties that have resulted from adoption of the new standards.

3. REQUIRED REFERRAL OF ZBA VARIANCES TO LOCAL CONSERVATION COMMISSIONS:
CGS Section 25-102h requires that variances within the Gateway Conservation zone be referred to the Gateway Commission for comment at least ten days prior to the public hearing on the variance. This is being done regularly in most Gateway towns. The same statute also requires that those variances be referred to the local conservation commission. Since this is an internal matter, the Gateway Commission has not monitored whether these referrals are being made, although informal conversations with town staff indicate that this may not be being done. Failure to make this mandatory referral could void a ZBA decision if challenged.
4. APPEAL OF CHESTER VARIANCE APPROVAL:
On June 20, 2005, the Chester Zoning Board of Appeals approved a variance of the required setback from the Connecticut River to allow the construction of a 3600 square foot new house on a low-lying sandbar just south of the Chrisholm marina in Chester. This approval was granted despite a request by the Gateway Commission to hold the hearing open for its formal comments and a negative recommendation from the Office of Long Island Sound Programs. The proposed structure was set closer to the river to maintain a setback from the wetlands located behind the sand bar. A previous variance request several years ago had been withdrawn by the applicant in the face of objections from both Gateway and DEP. At their June meeting, Gateway members voted to file an appeal of the decision. That appeal is underway. The ZBA’s attorney has directed land use staff not to issue any permits while the appeal is pending.

If you have any questions or comments about the above matters or any other Gateway issues, please do not hesitate to contact us at CRERPA, (860-388-3497) or crerpa@snet.net.
SECTION 9.5 East Haddam Village District (Formerly the C-1 District and areas of R-1)  
2/1/05

9.5.1 **Boundaries** The East Haddam Village District is defined as follows;

**Southern Boundary**

Beginning at a point on the southerly side of the property now or formerly identified as Assessor’s Map 17, Lot 8 at the Connecticut River, thence crossing easterly along the property line and across Lumberyard Road and including the properties that front Lumberyard Road and crossing Whippoorwill Terrace. The line continues south on Whippoorwill Terrace and includes the southern edge of a property identified as Assessor’s Map 17, Lot 77.

**Eastern Boundary**

Continuing at the southeast point of Assessor’s Map 17, Lot 77, the line runs north and includes the properties that front Whippoorwill Terrace and Creamery Road. The line follows the eastern edge of Assessor’s Map 17, Lot 48 until it reaches Ray Hill Road, then continues north to the intersection of Ray Hill Road and Norwich Road. The line moves across the street and southwest behind the properties fronting Norwich Road and crossing west on the north side of a property identified as assessor’s Map 17, Lot 37. The eastern border continues north along the backside of the lots fronting Main Street until the line meets Bonfoey Road. The line runs east along Bonfoey to the intersection of Bonfoey and Porges Road and continues north along Porges Road until it crosses Porges Road and runs behind the first four properties on Landing Hill Road.

**Northern Boundary**

From the Northeast point of the fourth property, now or formerly identified as Assessor’s Map 26, Lot 28, up Landing Hill Road the line runs directly west across Landing Hill Road and Route 149 to the Connecticut River.

**Western Boundary**

The line runs south from the above point along the Connecticut River to the original start point.

Please refer to the map entitled East Haddam Village District to determine the Sub-sets of the village.


9.5.2  Description of East Haddam Village

East Haddam Village was originally settled as two separate villages, Goodspeed Landing and Upper Landing, which competed for commercial enterprises. Historically, the area has always supported mixed/commercial/residential use and was the location of ship building yards, docks, lumberyards, and warehouses as well as stores, shops and residences. Overtime, the separate villages grew together as one and the village supported mills along Lumberyard and Creamery Roads and east up Succor Brook to Boardman Road, and a large music school (Maplewood). Hotels and banks grew up around the merchant activity along the river as steamships and trains brought commerce, visitors and new residents to town. Ferry service operated between Haddam and East Haddam until the opening of the Swingbridge in 1913. The village once supported tow local schoolhouses, and several churches and meeting halls. Many of East Haddam's influential families built grand houses in the Village District. With the decline of the river based commerce and the decline of the mills, the village, while still encouraging mixed use, went through a period when it was more residential in character. Today, with the resurgence of the Opera House and the Gelston House, the village is poised to once again become an area of vibrant economic and cultural activity.

Architecturally, the village reflects its long history including within mill buildings, framed sheds and outbuildings, and more formally, Federal, Georgian, and Greek revival, various Victorian styles (Second Empire, Carpenter Gothic, Italianate) and contemporary post World War II structures. Many structure exhibit characteristics from several periods. Archaeologically, the village retains evidence of its history in the extreme underground storm drains in the upper landing area, and the many dry rock walls and foundations of former structures which indicate that the village was more densely populated in the past.

East Haddam Village is situated on the east bank of the Connecticut River south of the mouth of the Salmon River and just north of Chapman's Pond. The Village is framed to the east by steep hills and the property from the east shore of the Connecticut River to the peaks of these hills is part of the Connecticut River Gateway Conservation Zone. This Conservation Zone consisting of 25,000 acres spread over eight towns was created to protect the natural, historic, and aesthetic values of the lower Connecticut River Valley. The lower Connecticut River is part of one of the richest and most complex ecological systems in the northeastern United States. In 1993, the International Chapter of the Nature Conservancy designated the Lower Connecticut River Tidelands as one of the "Last Great Places" in the world. The Lower Connecticut River area was designated at The Ramsar Convention as a "Wetlands of International Importance"; and especially important for migratory waterfowl habitat and bald eagles. In 1998, the US Fish and Wildlife also designated the Connecticut River and its tributaries as the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge. The United States Council on Environmental Quality selected the Connecticut River as one of the ten "American Heritage Rivers" in the United States. The multiple designations awarded to this watershed area emphasize the unique and abundant natural resources around East Haddam Village.

9.5.3  Intent

These regulations shall protect the distinctive character, landscape and historic structures within the district and may regulate, on and after the effective date of such regulations, new construction, substantial reconstruction and rehabilitation of properties within such district and in view from public roadways and public pedestrian walkways, including, but not limited to,

(1) The design and placement of buildings,
(2) The maintenance of public views,
(3) The design, paving materials and placement of public roadways, and
(4) Other elements that the Commission deems appropriate to maintain and protect the character of the village district.

In adopting this regulation, the Commission shall consider the design, relationship and compatibility of structures, plantings, signs, roadways, street hardware and other objects in public view.
9.5.4 Permitted Uses, Lot Coverage, Lot Impervious Surface Coverage, Side yard, and Height

Any new use of premises, buildings, or structures, or any Substantial Reconstruction or Rehabilitation of an existing premises, building, or structure shall require review by the Commission, the type of review being in accordance with the following table. For the purposes of this Section 9.5, the phrase "Substantial Reconstruction and Rehabilitation" is in accordance with: the meaning and use of the terms 8-2j(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes, and shall be defined as the threshold at which any and all reconstruction or rehabilitation becomes of such a degree as to likely noticeably affect the character of the structure in relation with the East Haddam Village District, as reflected through the Objective and Guidelines enumerated in Section 9.5.6 and Appendix VI.

The Use areas indicated in the table below are illustrated on East Haddam Village District Map, Appendix V to these Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Highest Use</th>
<th>Moderate Use</th>
<th>Lower Use</th>
<th>Lower Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater/Town Office Restaurant</td>
<td>EH Village/Norwich Rd Section of Main</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Creamery Lumberyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 family home</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 family home</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 family home</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRUD-LTSP housing</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Sales</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Inn</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty and Barber Shop</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.I.R.E.</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Store</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Offices</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private parking</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious use</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Artist/Crafts</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Movie</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Live</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory to permitted use</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Use</td>
<td>Moderate Use</td>
<td>Lower Use</td>
<td>Lower Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater/Town Office Restaurant</td>
<td>EH Village/Norwich Rd Section of Main</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Creamery Lumberyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lot Size | .25 acre | .25 acre | 1 acre | .25 acre |
| Building Coverage | ** | ** | 15% | 20% |
| Lot Impervious Surface Coverage | ** | ** | 30% | 30% |
| Maximum Building Height | *** | *** | *** | *** |

Front, side, and rear yard requirements for Live Theaters: Live Theater Uses - Five percent (5%) of the lot shall be assigned to the front, side, or rear yard setback area.

Front, side, and rear yard requirements for Uses other than Live Theaters: The yard requirements is that any building shall have yard dimensions sufficient to insure proper design and placement of a building as determined in the site plan review process and shall generally adhere to the setbacks of the surrounding properties which are in keeping with the historic layout of the neighborhood.

** - Lot and Building coverage shall have dimensions sufficient to insure proper design and placement of buildings and other surfaces (parking, patios, walkways, etc.) as determined in the site plan review process and shall generally be in keeping with the historic layout of the neighborhood. For Live Theaters, Lot Impervious Surface Coverage shall be (95%) and Building Coverage shall be (95%).

SE = Requires Special Exception Review  See Section 14B

SP = Requires Site Plan Review  See Section 14A

*** Maximum Building Height: See Section 10.1.4. For Live Theaters, Maximum Building Height shall have a maximum peak height elevation of 92.5 feet based on National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD).
9.5.5 Historic Preservation
These regulations shall encourage the conversion, conservation, and preservation of existing buildings in a manner that maintains the historic or distinctive character of the district. New construction shall also incorporate in the design elements that will maintain the historic or distinctive character of the district.

The conversion, conservation, and preservation of existing buildings and sites shall be consistent with:

(A) The “Connecticut Historical Commission - The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings”, revised through 1990, as amended:

Available at http://www2.cr.nps.gov/tps/tax/rhb/stand.htm, the Historic District Commission, or the East Haddam Land Use Office

Please note: For those Buildings, Structures, or Lots located within the Village District which are also within the boundaries of the East Haddam Historic District, the Planning and Zoning Commission hereby delegates to the East Haddam Historic District Commission the review and approval of all aspects of a development which are within the legal jurisdiction of that Commission. Evidence of approval by the East Haddam Historic District Commission shall be provided at the time of application to the Planning and Zoning Commission, which shall not over rule or modify any aspect of a development plan which has been approved by the Historic District Commission and is within the jurisdiction of that Commission.

9.5.6 Site Design and Compatibility Objectives

Applications shall provide a narrative, site plans, and design that demonstrate that the application is in compliance with subsections 9.5.5 and 9.5.6, including the approval of the East Haddam Historic District Commission where applicable, per Section 9.5.5. All development in the village district shall be designed to achieve the following compatibility objectives to the greatest extent possible. It is recognized that not all applications may be able to achieve each and every objective or in some cases a particular objective may not be applicable to the project. In cases where there is no change in the exterior appearance to the building or landscape the application shall still include a narrative and site plan of the existing conditions. These objectives are further defined in Appendix VI “Site Design and Compatibility Objectives and Guidelines”

1. that proposed buildings or modifications to existing buildings be harmoniously related to their surroundings and to the terrain in the district and to the use, scale and architecture of existing buildings in the district that have a functional or visual relationship to a proposed building or modification,

2. that all spaces, structures and related site improvements visible from public roadways be designed to be compatible with the elements of the area of the village district in and around the proposed building or modification,

3. that the color, size, height, location, proportion of openings, roof treatments, building materials and landscaping of commercial or residential property and any proposed signs and lighting be evaluated for compatibility with the local architectural motif and the maintenance of views, historic buildings, monuments and landscaping, and

4. that the removal or disruption of historic traditional or significant structures or architectural elements shall be minimized.

5. The building and layout of buildings and included site improvements shall reinforce existing buildings and streetscape patterns and the placement of buildings and included site improvements shall assure there is no adverse impact on the district;

6. proposed streets shall be connected to the existing district road network, wherever possible;

7. open spaces within the proposed development shall reinforce open space patterns of the district, in form and siting;

8. locally significant features of the site such as distinctive buildings or site lines of vistas from within the district, shall be integrated into the site design;

9. the landscape design shall complement the district’s landscape patterns;
10. the exterior signs, site lighting and accessory structures shall support a uniform architectural theme if such a theme exists and be compatible with their surroundings; and

11. the scale, proportions, massing and detailing of any proposed building shall be in proportion to the scale, proportion, massing and detailing in the district.

9.5.7 Architectural Review and Landscape Design

All special exception and site plan review applications for new construction and substantial reconstruction within the district and in view from public roadways and public pedestrian walkways shall be subject to review and recommendation by an architect or architectural firm, landscape architect, or planner who is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners selected and contracted by the Commission and designated as the village district consultant for such application. (Note: see fee schedule)

The village district consultant shall review an application and report to the Commission within thirty-five days of receipt of the application.

Such report and recommendation shall be entered into the public hearing record and considered by the Commission in making its decision.

Failure of the village district consultant to report within the specified time shall not alter or delay any other time limit imposed by the regulations.

9.5.8 Additional Reviews and Recommendations

The Commission may seek the recommendations of any town or regional agency or outside specialist with which it consults, including but not limited to the East Haddam Historic District Commission, the Midstate Regional Planning Agency, the East Haddam Historical Society, the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation, and the University of Connecticut College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

9.5.9 Compliance with Regulations

If a Commission grants or denies an application, it shall state upon the record the reasons for its decision.

If a Commission denies an application, the reason for the denial shall cite the specific regulations under which the applicant was denied.

Notice of the decision shall be published in a newspaper having a substantial circulation in the municipality.

An approval shall become effective in accordance with subsection (b) of section 8-3c.

9.5.10 Endorsement and Filing

Within sixty-five (65) days of the Commission/Board approval, the applicant shall submit one (1) set of the final plan(s) on mylar, reflecting all conditions or modifications required by the Commission, with the approval letters of the Planning and Zoning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Inland/Wetland and Watercourse Commission printed on them and accompanied by signed, sworn statements of the applicant's land surveyor, engineer, architect, and any other professional who has participated in the preparation of the application materials, to the effect that the plans submitted are the same as those approved by the Commission, except for the depiction of modifications and conditions required by the Commission in approval vote. If, upon considering the statements and reviewing the plans submitted, the Commission/Board shall find them to be in accordance with the final approval, they shall be endorsed by the signature of the Chairman or Secretary of the Commission. Thereafter, it shall be the responsibility of the applicant to file one (1) set of endorsed Mylar plans in the office of the Town Clerk, and two paper copies in the Office of the Zoning Enforcement Officer. In accordance with Section 8-3d of the Connecticut General Statutes, no Special Exception shall be effective until the final, endorsed plans are filed with the Town Clerk, and any plans not so filed within ninety (90) days following the Commission's vote of approval shall become null and void. Any Special Exception site plan filed in the Town Clerk's Office without the endorsement of the Commission's Chairman or Secretary shall likewise be void.
1. Proposed buildings or modifications to existing buildings should be harmoniously related to their surroundings, and the terrain in the district and to the use, scale and architecture of existing buildings in the district that have functional or visual relationship to a proposed building or modification.

Guidelines:

1a) Development in the village should enhance and encourage the enjoyment of the Connecticut River and other natural areas by provide or preserve visual and pedestrian connections between the village and the Connecticut River and other natural features.

1b) Identify existing natural features and incorporate these features as design elements in order to enhance the relationship of the built to the natural environment.

1c) Protect and enhance significant natural features (e.g. wetlands, streams, floodplain, rock outcrops, forested areas) and places that lend a unique character to the specific setting (e.g. special open space, rare vegetation, scenic water features, wildlife habitat, etc.).

1d) Preserve and protect archeological elements of site, or if they cannot be preserved have a qualified archeologist document findings in accordance with Section 4.17 through 4.17 of the East Haddam Subdivision Regulations.

1e) Create clear boundaries between different uses or different neighborhood densities by establishing visually interesting open spaces or vegetated buffers.

1f) To organize architectural composition, make use of prominent site features.
2. All spaces, structures and related site improvements visible from public road and water ways should be designed to be compatible with the elements of the area of the village district in and around the proposed building or modification.

Guidelines:

2a) Design parking areas that are consistent with the existing scale, historic nature and aesthetic of the village, by making use of existing topography and creating small, dispersed parking areas that are easily found, interconnected by pedestrian access ways and accessible to businesses and other village venues.

2b) Create a strong architectural edge on street front by locating the majority of parking at the rear of the building, when possible, and the remainder in the side yard.

2c) Provide for a landscaped buffer screening parking from street view and from adjacent residential properties.

2d) Keep covered parking compatible in scale, character and detail with the architecture that it serves.

2e) Provide vehicle barriers (curbs, bollards or low walls) only where necessary to protect public safety.

2f) Illuminate parking area for security and safety, but reduce the impact of this lighting on adjacent properties through the use of cut-off fixtures and/or the reduction of lighting after hours.

2g) Design parking landscape islands and perimeters that serve multiple uses as buffers, screens, pedestrian access ways and bioretention for stormwater in order to integrate parking areas into surroundings to create a parklike setting.
3. The color, size, height, location, proportion of openings, roof treatments, building materials and landscaping of commercial or residential property and any proposed signs and lighting should be evaluated for compatibility with the local architectural motif and the maintenance of views, historic buildings, monuments and landscaping.

Guidelines:

3a) Coordinate color, materials, architectural form, and detailing to achieve continuity with neighboring buildings and the Village as a whole to reinforce harmony and beauty.

3b) Consider rooflines of adjacent buildings to avoid clashes of style and material.

3c) Establish visual continuity and building rhythms with adjacent building forms.

3d) Reference adjacent building roof details: Dormers, fascias, roof pitches, overhangs, etc.

3e) Include architectural detailing and apply it consistently throughout the design. Ensure such detailing is compatible with the historical context.

3f) Build protective canopies, stairs, columns, wall or roof projections and recesses, etc. to human scale at sidewalk level to encourage pedestrian use.

3g) Create visual variety, aid in climate control, and establish character by creating shadow patterns using architectural elements (e.g. overhangs, trellises, projections, reveals and awnings)

3h) Accentuate entrances with strong definition and individual legibility for individual tenants.
3i) Arrange window patterns with a visually balanced spacing and conscious rhythm.

3j) Respect, complement and/or enhance local historic detailing with compatible roof forms and shapes.

3k) Avoid large, unarticulated or monolithic areas on building facades. Use detailing to add relief and shadow patterns to otherwise flat facades.

3l) Use natural materials in their traditional applications (e.g. wood, stone, brick, glass, metal etc.) and try to avoid the use of vinyl or aluminum siding, finish systems etc.

3m) Design to create visually inspiring and proportionally pleasing spatial relationships between buildings, open space and setbacks on adjacent sites.

3n) Create visual variety using building clustering, surface recesses, projections and open space interruptions.

3o) Avoid long, large, unarticulated structures that are visually uninviting and do not contribute to the streetscape.
11. The scale, proportion, massing and detailing of any proposed building shall be in proportion to the scale, proportion, massing and detailing in the district.

Guidelines:

11a) Balance the visual relationships of building bulk and size with its site, especially when viewed from a distant vantage point.

11b) Break larger building volumes into smaller forms to lessen the total building mass and provide continuity with nearby building patterns.

11c) Maintain proportions between building height, length and width consistent with prevailing architectural standards to avoid visual distortions and exaggerations.

11d) Strive for visual simplicity rather than complexity.